1	LAW OFFICES OF RONALD A. MA	RRON, APLC			
$1 \mid$	RONALD A. MARRON (SBN 175650)	- ,			
2	ron@consumersadvocates.com				
3	SKYE RESENDES (SBN 278511)				
	skye@consumersadvocates.com				
4	ALEXIS WOOD (SBN 270200) alexis@consumersadvocates.com				
5	KAS GALLUCCI (SBN 288709)				
	kas@consumersadvocates.com				
6	651 Arroyo Drive				
7	San Diego, California 92103				
8	Telephone: (619) 696-9006				
	Facsimile: (619) 564-6665				
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed	d Class			
10	LIMITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT			
11					
12	SOUTHERN DISTR	ICT OF CALIFORNIA			
13	WENDY BOYLAN, on behalf of	Case No.: <u>'13CV2020 DMS BGS</u>			
14	herself, and all others similarly situated,	CLASS ACTION			
15	Plaintiff,				
16		COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES			
	V.	AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF PURSUANT TO THE TELEPHONE			
17	THINGS REMEMBERED, INC.,	CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT,			
18		47 U.S.C. §§ 227 et seq.			
19	Defendant.	_			
		DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL			
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

///

INTRODUCTION

1. Wendy Boylan ("Plaintiff" or "Plaintiff Boylan") brings this Class Action Complaint for damages, injunctive relief, and any other available legal or equitable remedies, resulting from the illegal actions of Things Remembered, Inc. ("Defendant" or "Things Remembered"), in negligently, and/or willfully contacting Plaintiff through SMS or "text" messages on Plaintiff's cellular telephone, in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. §§ 227 et seq., ("TCPA"), thereby invading Plaintiff's privacy. Plaintiff alleges as follows upon personal knowledge as to her own acts and experiences, and, as to all other matters, upon information and belief, including investigation conducted by her attorneys.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. Jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2) because Plaintiff seeks up to \$1,500 in damages for each text message in violation of the TCPA, which, when aggregated among a proposed class number in the tens of thousands, exceeds the \$5,000,000 threshold for federal court jurisdiction. Further, Plaintiff alleges a national class, which will result in at least one class member belonging to a different state than that of Defendant, providing jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A). Therefore, both elements of diversity jurisdiction under the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 ("CAFA") are present, and this Court has jurisdiction.
- 3. This Court has federal question subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, as the action arises under the TCPA, a federal statute.
- 4. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and 1441(a) because Defendant is deemed to reside in any judicial district in which they are subject to personal jurisdiction at the time the action is commenced, and because Defendant's contacts with this District, are sufficient to subject it to personal jurisdiction.

PARTIES

- 5. Plaintiff Boylan is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a resident of the State of Connecticut. She is, and at all times mentioned herein was a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (32).
- 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant Things Remembered is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a Delaware corporation, whose primary corporate offices are located at 5500 Avion Park Drive, Highland Heights, OH 44143, and is a "person," as defined by 47 U.S.C § 153 (32). Things Remembered is licensed to conduct business in California, as entity number C1546919, and has appointed Corporation Service Company, 2710 Gateway Oaks Dr Ste 150N, Sacramento CA 95833, as its agent for service of process
- 7. Defendant is engaged in the business of selling personalized gifts which can be engraved throughout the United State.
- 8. Plaintiff alleges that at all times relevant herein Defendant conducted business in the state of California and in the County of San Diego, and within this judicial district.

THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1991 (TCPA), 47 U.S.C. §§ 227 et seq.

- 9. In 1991, Congress enacted the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 (TCPA),¹ in response to a growing number of consumer complaints regarding certain telemarketing practices.
- 10. The TCPA regulates, among other things, the use of automated telephone equipment, or "autodialers." Specifically, the plain language of section 227(b)(1)(A)(iii) prohibits the use of autodialers to make any call to a wireless

¹ Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, Pub. L. No. 102-243, 105 Stat. 2394 (1991), codified at 47 U.S.C. § 227 (TCPA). The TCPA amended Title II of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. §§ 201 *et seq*.

number in the absence of an emergency or the prior express consent of the called party.²

- 11. According to findings by the Federal Communication Commission ("FCC"), the agency Congress vested with authority to issue regulations implementing the TCPA, such calls are prohibited because, as Congress found, automated or prerecorded telephone calls are a greater nuisance and invasion of privacy than live solicitation calls, and such calls can be costly and inconvenient. The FCC also recognized that wireless customers are charged for incoming calls whether they pay in advance or after the minutes are used.³
- 12. On January 4, 2008, the FCC released a Declaratory Ruling wherein it confirmed that autodialed and prerecorded message calls to a wireless number by a creditor (or on behalf of a creditor) are permitted only if the calls are made with the "prior express consent" of the called party.⁴ The FCC "emphasize[d] that prior express consent is deemed to be granted only if the wireless number was provided by the consumer to the creditor, and that such number was provided during the transaction that resulted in the debt owed."⁵

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

13. One of the newest types of bulk marketing is to advertise through Short Message Services. The term "Short Message Service" or "SMS" is a messaging

² 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).

³ Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, CG Docket No. 02-278, Report and Order, 18 FCC Rcd 14014 (2003).

⁴ In the Matter of Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 ("FCC Declaratory Ruling"), 23 F.C.C.R. 559, 23 FCC Rcd. 559, 43 Communications Reg. (P&F) 877, 2008 WL 65485 (F.C.C.) (2008).

⁵ *FCC Declaratory Ruling*, 23 F.C.C.R. at 564-65 (¶ 10).

system that allows cellular telephone subscribers to use their cellular telephones to send and receive short text messages, usually limited to 160 characters.

- 14. An "SMS message" is a text message call directed to a wireless device through the use of the telephone number assigned to the device. When an SMS or "text" message call is successfully made, the recipient's cell phone rings or otherwise notes the receipt of the text message, alerting him or her that a call is being received. As cellular telephones are inherently mobile and are frequently carried on their owner's person, calls to cellular telephones, including SMS messages, may be received by the called party virtually anywhere worldwide.
- 15. Unlike more conventional advertisements, such text messages actually costs their recipients money, because cell phone users must frequently pay their wireless service providers either for each text message call they receive or incur a usage allocation deduction to their text plan, regardless of whether or not the message is authorized.
- 16. Over the course of an extended period beginning no later than July of 2013, Defendant and its agents directed the mass transmission of text messages to cell phones nationwide.
- 17. Beginning in July of 2013 and continuing to the present time, Plaintiff Boylan received various text messages from Defendant regarding sales and other promotions at its stores.
- 18. Specifically, on July 26, 2013, Plaintiff Boylan received the following text messages from SMS code 874438:
 - "Things Remembered: "I still get thanked for the gift I engraved. Five years ago." Andy N., Cleveland, Ohio"
- 19. Plaintiff Boylan continued to receive similar text messages promoting Defendant's business on August 2, 2013, August 9, 2013, August 16, 2013 and

August 23, 2013, from the same SMS code 874438, which did not provide a method for opt-out.

- 20. These unsolicited text messages sent to Plaintiff Boylan's cellular telephone were placed via an "automatic telephone dialing system," ("ATDS") as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (a)(1), as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A), which had the capacity to store or produce numbers randomly or sequentially, and to dial such numbers, to place telephone calls and/or SMS or text messages to Plaintiff's cellular telephone.
- 21. The telephone number that Defendant, or its agents, sent the text messages to were assigned to cellular telephone services for which Plaintiff incurred a charge for incoming calls or text messages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).
- 22. These telephone text messages constituted "calls" under the TCPA that were not for emergency purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A)(i).
- 23. Plaintiff Boylan did not provide Defendant or its agents prior express consent to receive unsolicited text messages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).
- 24. These telephone confirmatory text messages by Defendant or its agents violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 25. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and on behalf of all others similarly situated ("the Class").
- 26. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of the Class consisting of all persons within the United States who received any unsolicited SMS or text messages from Defendant or its agents on their paging service, cellular phone service, mobile radio service, radio common carrier service, or other service for which they were charged for the SMS or text messages, through the use of any automatic telephone dialing system as set forth in 47 U.S.C. § 227(B)(1)(A)(3) or artificial or prerecorded voice, which SMS or text messages by Defendant or its agents were not made for

emergency purposes or with the recipients' prior express consent, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

- 27. Defendant and its employees or agents are excluded from the Class. Plaintiff does not know the number of members in the Class, but believes the Class members number in the hundreds of thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter should be certified as a Class action to assist in the expeditious litigation of this matter.
- 28. Plaintiff and members of the Class were harmed by the acts of Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant, either directly or through their agents, illegally contacted Plaintiff and the Class members via their cellular telephones by using unsolicited SMS or text messages, thereby causing Plaintiff and the Class members to incur certain cellular telephone charges or reduce cellular telephone time for which Plaintiff and the Class members previously paid, and invading the privacy of said Plaintiff and the Class members. Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged thereby.
- 29. This suit seeks only damages and injunctive relief for recovery of economic injury on behalf of the Class and it expressly is not intended to request any recovery for personal injury and claims related thereto. Plaintiff reserves the right to expand the Class definition to seek recovery on behalf of additional persons as warranted as facts are learned in further investigation and discovery.
- 30. The joinder of the Class members is impractical and the disposition of their claims in the Class action will provide substantial benefits both to the parties and to the court. The Class can be identified through Defendant's records or Defendant's agents' records.
- 31. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact involved affecting the parties to be represented. The questions of law and fact to the Class predominate over questions which may affect individual Class members, including the following:

- a. Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, Defendant or its agents sent SMS or text messages without the recipients' prior express consent (other than SMS or text messages made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) to a Class member using any automatic telephone dialing to any telephone number assigned to a cellular telephone service;
- b. Whether Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and
- c. Whether Defendant and its agents should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future.
- 32. As persons who received at least one unsolicited SMS or text message without Plaintiff's prior express consent, Plaintiff is asserting a claim that is typical of the Class. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class in that Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to any member of the Class.
- 33. Plaintiff and the members of the Class have all suffered irreparable harm as a result of the Defendant's unlawful and wrongful conduct. Absent a class action, the Class will continue to face the potential for irreparable harm. In addition, these violations of law will be allowed to proceed without remedy and Defendant will likely continue such illegal conduct. Because of the size of the individual Class member's claims, few, if any, Class members could afford to individually seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein.
- 34. Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in handling class action claims and claims involving violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. A class action is a superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Class-wide damages are essential to induce Defendant to comply with federal law. The interest of Class members in individually controlling the

prosecution of separate claims against Defendant is small because the maximum statutory damages in an individual action for violation of privacy are minimal. Management of these claims is likely to present significantly fewer difficulties than those presented in many class claims.

35. Defendant has acted on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief and corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the Class as a whole.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT 47 U.S.C. §§ 227 ET SEQ.

- 36. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 37. Each SMS or text message was made using equipment that, upon information and belief, had the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers, using a random or sequential number generator, and to dial such numbers. By using such equipment, Defendant was able to effectively send thousands of text messages simultaneously to lists of thousands of wireless phone numbers of consumers without human intervention. These text messages were made en masse through the use of a short code and without the prior express consent of the Plaintiff and the other members of the Class to receive such text messages.
- 38. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant and its agents constitute numerous and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. §§ 227 *et seq*.
- 39. As a result of Defendant's, and Defendant's agents', negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. §§ 227 *et seq.*, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

5

6

7 8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25 26

27

///

28

40. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE

TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

47 U.S.C. §§ 227 ET SEO.

- 41. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the above paragraphs 1 through 35 inclusive, of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 42. Each SMS or text message was made using equipment that, upon information and belief, had the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers, using a random or sequential number generator, and to dial such numbers. By using such equipment, Defendant was able to effectively send thousands of text messages simultaneously to lists of thousands of wireless phone numbers of consumers without human intervention. These text messages were made en masse through the use of a short code and without the prior express consent of the Plaintiff and the other members of the Class to receive such text messages.
- 43. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitutes numerous and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. §§ 227 et seq.
- 44. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. §§ 227 et seq., Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500.00, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).
- 45. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF 1 2 Wherefore, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court grant Plaintiff and the Class 3 members the following relief against Defendant: 4 FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR NEGLIGENT VIOLATION OF THE TCPA, 47 U.S.C. §§ 227 ET SEQ. 5 46. 6 As a result of Defendant's, and Defendant's agents', negligent 7 violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), Plaintiff seeks for herself and each Class 8 member \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 9 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B). Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief 10 47. 11 prohibiting such conduct in the future. 12 48. Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper. 13 SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL 14 VIOLATION OF THE TCPA, 47 U.S.C. §§ 227 ET Seq. 15 49. As a result of Defendant's, and Defendant's agents' willful and/or 16 knowing violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), Plaintiff seeks for herself and each 17 Class member treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500.00 for each and 18 every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C). 19 50. Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future. 20 Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper. 21 51. 22 23 JURY DEMAND Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable. 24 25 26 Dated: August 29, 2013 /s/ Ronald A. Marron By: Ronald A. Marron 27 28

1	LAW OFFICES OF RONALD A.
2	MARRON, APLC RONALD A. MARRON
3	SKYE RESENDES
4	ALEXIS WOOD
5	KAS GALLUCCI 651 Arroyo Drive
	San Diego, California 92103
6	Telephone: (619) 696-9006
7	Facsimile: (619) 564-6665
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
$\begin{bmatrix} 27 \\ 28 \end{bmatrix}$	
_0	11

Case: 1:14-cv-00049-CAB Doc #: 1 Filed: 08/29/13 12 of 13. PageID #: 12

Case: 1:14-cv-00049-CAB Port#: 13 of 13. PageID #: 13

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS WENDY BOYLAN, on be	uated	DEFENDANTS THINGS REMEMBERED, INC.					
(b) County of Residence (EZ		County of Resider	(IN U.S. F IN LAND C	red Defendant PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF T OF LAND INVOLVED.			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Law Offices of Ronald A. Marron, APLC 651 Arroyo Drive, San Diego, CA 92103 (619) 696-9006				Attorneys (If Known) 13 CV2020 DMS BGS			
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" i	n One Box Only)	III. C	TIZENSHIP OF	PRINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff)
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government N	lot a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only	y) PTF DEF 1 1 1	Incorporated or Proof Business In This	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	•		Citiz	Citizen of Another State \square 2 \square 2 Incorporated and Principe of Business In Another			
W MATTIDE OF CHIE	P			en or Subject of a reign Country	3 3	Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		nly) RTS	FO	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	Y BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Slander Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability Liability Liability Liability	eY □ 62 - y □ 69	25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 88 00 Other	☐ 422 Appe ☐ 423 With 28 U	ral 28 USC 158 drawal SC 157 RTY RIGHTS rrights at	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ☐ 480 Consumer Credit	
(Excl. Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise		Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage	g	LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 10 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical Leave Act 20 Other Labor Litigation 21 Empl. Ret. Inc.	□ 861 HIA □ 862 Black □ 863 DIW □ 864 SSID □ 865 RSI (c Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI	□ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange ■ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PRISONER PETTTIO □ 510 Motions to Vaca Sentence Habeas Corpus: □ 530 General □ 535 Death Penalty □ 540 Mandamus & Ot □ 550 Civil Rights □ 555 Prison Condition □ 560 Civil Detaince - Conditions of Confinement	her	IMMIGRATION 52 Naturalization Applicat 53 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee (Prisoner Petition) 55 Other Immigration Actions	□ 870 Taxe: or Do □ 871 IRS— 26 U	AL TAX SUITS s (U.S. Plaintiff efendant) —Third Party (SC 7609	
本 1 Original □ 2 Res	te Court	Remanded from Appellate Court	Reo	stated or 5 Tra	ansferred from other district	☐ 6 Multidistr	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON Cite the U.S. Civil Sta 47 U.S.C. Section Brief description of ca		re filing (Consur	Do not cite jurisdictional mer Protection Act	statutes unless d i 5:552	iversity):	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R.C.P.	IS A CLASS ACTION 23	N D	EMAND \$		HECK YES only URY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	T NUMBER	
DATE		SIGNATURE OF A	ITORNEY	OF RECORD			
08/29/2013		/s/Ronald A. M	1arron				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # AM	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	I	MAG. JUI	DGE